

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Jeffrey A. Aaron et al.

Serial No.: 10/675,517

Filed: September 30, 2003

For: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR PROVIDING ALERTS

Confirmation No.: 6101

Examiner: Robert M. Timblin

Group Art Unit: 2167

Date: September 13, 2007

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4) to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on September 13, 2007.

Signature:



Rosa Lee Brinson

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.41

Sir:

This Reply Brief is filed in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed July 13, 2007.

It is not believed that an extension of time and/or additional fee(s) are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. In the event, however, that an extension of time is necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such an extension is hereby petitioned for under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a). Any additional fees believed to be due in connection with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0220.

I. The Examiner's Answer – Response to Argument

Appellants will refrain herein from readdressing all of the deficiencies with the pending rejections and, therefore, in the interest of brevity, Appellants hereby incorporate herein the arguments set out in Appellants' Brief on Appeal filed March 7, 2007 (hereinafter "Brief") as if set forth in their entirety. Accordingly, Appellants will only address new arguments made in the Examiner's Answer.

In re: Jeffrey A. Aaron et al.

Serial No.: 10/675,517

Filed: September 30, 2003

Page 2

In the "Response to Argument" section beginning on page 10, the Examiner's Answer attempts to rebut Appellants' arguments set forth in Section I of the Brief. Appellants will respond to the arguments in the Examiner's Answer for this section below.

As explained on page 5 of the Brief, Appellants acknowledge that Sands discloses storing a user's biometric profile in a database that may reside, for example, in storage media 205 shown in FIG. 2. (Sands, paragraphs 50, 53, and 69). Appellants also acknowledge that Sands discloses the ability to disable a user or a location. (Sands, paragraph 73). Appellants submit, however, that nowhere does Sands disclose or suggest storing a user's biometric profile and disabled/not-disabled status in the same database. On page 11 of the Examiner's Answer, paragraphs 54 and 13 of Sands are cited for the conclusion that "a user profile may store access configurations (i.e., privileges) along with biometric information." Neither of these paragraphs, however, suggest storing the biometric information and the disabled/not-disabled status for a user in the same database. The Examiner's Answer further cites paragraph 69 of Sands, which describes the retrieval of the user's biometric profile from a persistent storage medium as allegedly teaching the storage of the biometric profile and disabled/not-disabled status in the same database. This paragraph, however, only describes the storage and retrieval of the biometric profile information. The arrow shown in FIG. 2 of Sands illustrating the authentication policy's 215 ability to access the database 205 represents the retrieval of biometric information from the database 205. Paragraph 73 of Sands does describe the authentication policy 215 determining if a user or location has been disabled. There is no mention in this paragraph that the disabled/not-disabled status for a user is stored in the same database that is used to hold the biometric information. Appellants further note that FIG. 3 of Sands is described as illustrating "a user entry in the database." (Sands, paragraph 17). Importantly, the user record shown in FIG. 3 only contains a user identification field and several biometric information fields. The user record does not include any field indicating disabled/not-disabled status.

Appellants continue to maintain that Sands does not disclose or suggest storing biometric information along with disabled/not-disabled status for a user in the same database.

In re: Jeffrey A. Aaron et al.
Serial No.: 10/675,517
Filed: September 30, 2003
Page 3

II. Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth in above and in Appellants' Brief on Appeal, Appellant requests reversal of the rejections of the pending claims, allowance of the pending claims, and passing of the application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,



D. Scott Moore
Registration No. 42,011

Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
P. O. Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: (919) 854-1400
Facsimile: (919) 854-1401
Customer No. 39072